

Application No.: 09/882,109

Docket No.: 20136-00324-US

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 15 and 17 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested. The undersigned would like to thank the Examiner in charge of the application for the brief telephone interview held in connection with this matter on March 31, 2005. During the interview, the undersigned urged that the application may be allowed by making amendments to the claims to incorporate the subject matter of the dependent claims. While the Examiner did not indicate whether or not such action would result in allowance, he encouraged the submission of such an amendment and would review the same when acting on the application.

Claim 1 is amended to further distinguish it from both Kohler (U.S. Pat. No. 6,192,396) and Voticky et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,351,764). In accordance with claim 1, a process is described where a text message can be sent to a list of recipients, where certain recipients can receive the message with a specific portion highlighted, and others receive the message without the highlighting. In accordance with claim 1, two tags are appended to the addresses of the recipient. The first tag represents an attention level, and a second a portion of the message which is highlighted for that recipient. When a recipient receives the message, he displays both the message and an attention level with a specific portion highlighted for the recipient while other recipients do not obtain any highlighting in their displayed messages.

Turning to the Kohler reference, a system is described which allows a sender to send portions of a message to different recipients. Reviewing the reference, there is no indication that any attention level is sent by the originator, or displayed by a recipient as stated in applicants claims. Further, there doesn't appear to be any highlighting of a complete message, where highlighting only appears to specific addressees as is set forth in claim 1 and those claims which depend thereon.

Application No.: 09/882,109

Docket No.: 20136-00324-US

Voticky et al. also does not describe any process where a sender can independently apply an attention level to a message being sent to a plurality of recipients. In Voticky et al., it is the recipient who decides on how messages will be categorized when they are received, not the sender. Only if the sender is given a specific PAC number in Voticky et al., can messages arriving from the sender be sent to a specific mailbox. The process or prioritizing is controlled by the recipient as distinguished from the sender as set forth in the present application. Claim 9 is also directed to displaying a message which identifies a portion of the message as being highlighted, and displays the highlighted portion when the tag is determined to be present.

Neither the Kohler or Voticky et al. reference describes any such feature of highlighting a message.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite the fact that the sender uses pop-up tables to select various attention levels for each addressee of a message. A tag is inserted in the message to identify the selected attention level. Neither Kohler nor Voticky et al. describe any sender generated attention level tag.

Claim 15 has been amended to recite the computer readable medium which stores a program to allow individual addressees to receive a tag identifying an attention level for each addressee. The process of displaying a terminal pop-up table which identifies each address to which the mail is directed, and then displaying on said computer terminal a pop-up table to identify various attention levels which may be assigned to each addressee is not shown in Kohler. Kohler merely provides for sending portions of a message to different parties, not any attention level or a complete message sent to all parties. Voticky et al. as noted previous is related only to prioritizing messages by a *recipient* not a *sender*. Claim 15 specifically is directed to having a sender assign attention levels to a message.

Application No.: 09/882,109

Docket No.: 20136-00324-US

Finally, claim 17 also is directed to a computer readable medium which stores a program to receive electronic mail messages. The program determines if the message contains a tag identifying an attention level for the message, and then displays the attention level with the message. In reviewing both the Kohler and Voticky et al. references, there is not suggestion of the displaying a sender generated attention level.

Further the claim also includes the feature of highlighting a portion of the message for a specific recipient, and then displaying the message with the highlighted portion. This combination of features does not appear anywhere in the reference, nor do the individual features appear in Kohler or Voticky et al.

In view of the foregoing, wherein the applicant has amended claims to more specific distinguish this subject matter from the prior art, favorable reconsideration is believed to be in order.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 09-0458, under Order No. 20136-00324-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

4/21/05

Respectfully submitted,

By 

George R. Pettit, Reg. No. 27,369
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-3425
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant